

Rev. 08/23/2003

Attorney Docket No. CMRX-001/01US
Serial No. 09/864,595
Page 8

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were previously pending in the subject application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-26. Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 11, and 17, cancelled claim 2, and added new claims 27-29. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-29 are now pending in the subject application. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of SNYDER (Gradient Elution, High-Performance Liquid Chromatography, 1980, Vol. 1, Academic Press, Inc., New York). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with respect to claims 1-26. Nonetheless, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the subject application, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 17 to more fully distinguish over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 1 includes a number of limitations that are not shown or suggested by the prior art of record. For instance, independent claim 1 recites "identifying an analytical retention time and corresponding analytical chromatographic parameters for eluting the component through an analytical column" and, "based on the analytical retention time and the corresponding analytical chromatographic parameters, determining preparative chromatographic parameters to isolate the component at a *pre-selected* accelerated retention time using a preparative column that is *different* from the analytical column." Applicant's review of SNYDER did not identify any teaching directed to the claimed method of "determining preparative chromatographic parameters to isolate the component at a *pre-selected* accelerated retention time using a preparative column," where this determining is based on "an analytical retention time and corresponding analytical chromatographic parameters for eluting the component through an analytical column," and the "preparative column ... is *different* from the analytical column." While SNYDER makes reference to varying flowrate and/or column length for improvement in resolution, SNYDER does not show or suggest the claimed method of, "based on the analytical retention time and the corresponding analytical chromatographic parameters, determining preparative chromatographic parameters to isolate the component at a *pre-selected* accelerated retention time using a preparative column that is *different* from the analytical column."

670713 v1/PA
#D5X011.DOC

Rev. 08/22/2003

Attorney Docket No. CMRX-001/01US
Serial No. 09/864,595
Page 9

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 defines subject matter that is not shown or suggested by the prior art of record. Therefore, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 3-10, 22, and 27 should be in a condition for allowance.

Independent claim 11 also includes a number of limitations that are not shown or suggested by the prior art of record. For instance, independent claim 11 recites "identifying a first set of gradient elution parameters to elute the component through a first column at a first elution time," "selecting a second elution time," and, "using the first set of gradient elution parameters, determining a second set of gradient elution parameters to elute the component through a second column at the second elution time, wherein the first column and the second column have *different* sizes." Applicant's review of SNYDER did not identify any teaching directed to the claimed method of "selecting a second elution time" and "determining a second set of gradient elution parameters to elute the component through a second column at the second elution time," where this determining uses "a first set of gradient elution parameters to elute the component through a first column at a first elution time," and "the first column and the second column have *different* sizes." Again, while SNYDER makes reference to varying flowrate and/or column length for improvement in resolution, SNYDER does not show or suggest the claimed method of independent claim 11.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 11 defines subject matter that is not shown or suggested by the prior art of record. Therefore, independent claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-16, 23-24, and 28 should be in a condition for allowance.

Independent claim 17 also includes a number of limitations that are not shown or suggested by the prior art of record. For instance, independent claim 17 recites "identifying the component by eluting a first portion of the chemical mixture through a first column using a first set of gradient elution parameters," "identifying a first retention time for the component associated with the first column and the first set of gradient elution parameters," "selecting a second retention time," and, "using the first retention time and the first set of gradient elution parameters, determining a second set of gradient elution parameters to elute the component through a second column at the second retention time, wherein the first column and the second column have *different* sizes." Applicant's review of SNYDER did not identify any teaching directed to the claimed method of "selecting a second retention time" and "determining a second set of gradient elution parameters to elute the component through a second column at the second

670713 v1/PA
#DSX011.DOC

Rev. 08/22/2003

Attorney Docket No. CMRX-001/01US

Serial No. 09/864,595

Page 10

retention time," where this determining uses a first retention time and a first set of gradient elution parameters for "eluting a first portion of the chemical mixture through a first column," and "the first column and the second column have *different* sizes." Again, while SNYDER makes reference to varying flowrate and/or column length for improvement in resolution, SNYDER does not show or suggest the claimed method of independent claim 17.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 17 defines subject matter that is not shown or suggested by the prior art of record. Therefore, independent claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-21, 25-26, and 29 should be in a condition for allowance.


In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that SNYDER fails to show or suggest the structure or implementation of the invention as recited in Claims 1 and 3-29 and, thus, that the reference cannot, as a matter of law, render the invention obvious under 35 USC §103(a). Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant submits that all of the independent claims and their associated dependent claims should now be in a condition for allowance, which is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes that any of the claims are not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve any outstanding issues.

Dated: February 17, 2004

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By: _____


Cliff Z. Liu
Reg. No. 50,834

670713 v1/PA
#DSX011.DOC